REMARKS

In the action dated November 3, 2004 the Examiner has once again rejected Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsukagoshi*, United States Patent Number 6,058,311 in view of *Alger et.al.*, United States Patent Number 5,913,217. That rejection is once again respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has once again asserted a belief that *Tsukagoshi* teaches the substituting of an anonymous identifier for a mobile system's real unique identifier "in order to disguise the identify of the mobile station to an application requesting a unique identifier for the mobile terminal ..." citing the abstract. Applicant once again urges the Examiner to consider that the abstract merely states that *Tsukagoshi* teaches the assigning of a temporary identifier to a mobile station in response to a local registration request, and an incoming call request which are transmitted from the mobile station to a network where the mobile station is located. Thereafter, *Tsukagoshi's* abstract states expressly "using such a frequently changed temporary identifier, the mobile station is identified by a home memory station." Applicant therefore once again urges the Examiner to consider that it is beyond cavil that the temporary identifier utilized by the mobile station in *Tsukagoshi* cannot, by an stretch of the imagination, be said to "disguise an identify of the mobile station to an application requesting a unique identifier for a mobile terminal" as asserted by the Examiner.

Further evidence of the inappropriate nature of the Examiner's rejection under *Tsukagoshi* can be found by carefully examining Claims 1 and 8 in the present application. Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to consider the Claims 1 and 8 do not merely recite the substitution of an anonymous Universal Unique Identifier for a computer systems real Universal Unique Identifier in order to disguise the identity of that computer system but rather a technique which utilizes a very specific process to accomplish that process. Specifically, Claims 1 and 8 expressly recite a primary location in a storage device within the computer system which is utilized to store the Universal Unique Identifier (UUID), the generation of an anonymous UUID and thereafter the claim recites "storing said anonymous UUID in said primary location within said storage device..."

Even a casual examination of *Tsukagoshi* reveals at Figure 1B thereof that the actual ID for a particular mobile terminal is stored within ID ROM 204 while the temporary ID is stored within ID TEMP RAM 205.

As each of the claims in the present application, either directly or indirectly, recites the storage of a UUID within a primary location, the generation of an anonymous UUID and the storing of that anonymous UUID in that particular location it is beyond cavil that *Tsukagoshi* cannot be said to show or suggest the claims of the present application.

Storage of the anonymous UUID in the primary location within in the computer system is a key aspect of efficiently utilizing an anonymous UUID in response to a request for the computer systems UUID. Consequently, Applicant urges that *Tsukagoshi*, cannot be a valid reference against the claims of the present application in that *Tsukagoshi* teaches a technique which is directly contrary to the expressly claimed invention set forth within Claims 1 and 8.

The Examiner has cited *Alger et al.* for it teaching of the generation and compression of a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID); however, nothing within *Alger et al.* can be said to show or suggest the creation of an anonymous UUID and the storage of that anonymous UUID in the specific location within the system which is utilized to store the actual UUID of the computer system. Consequently, *Alger et al.*, whether considered alone or in combination with *Tsukagoshi,* cannot be said to show or suggest the invention set forth within the present claims and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and passage of these claims to issue is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 2-7 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsukagoshi* in view of *Alger et al.* and further in view of *Gabber et al.*, United States Patent Number 5,961,593. That rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As noted in Applicants previous response, *Gabber et al.* teaches the interposition of a proxy device between a user and a server in order to protect the identity of the user and fails to show or suggest in any way the disguising of the real identity of a computer system by providing an anonymous UUID which is stored within that system in the primary location utilized to store the actual UUID of the computer system in the manner set forth expressly within the claims of

the present Application. Consequently, Applicant urges that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 2-7 and 9-14 over this combination of references is not well founded and withdraw this rejection and passage of these claims to issue is also respectfully requested.

In summary, the claims of the present application expressly and directly recite the provision of a primary location within a storage device which is designated for the storage of a UUID for a computer system, the generation of an anonymous UUID and the storage of that anonymous UUID in the aforementioned primary location so that the anonymous UUID is provided in response to a request for that computer systems UUID. In the absence of any showing or suggestion of this technique in the cited references the withdrawal of all rejections and passage to issue of Claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No additional fees or extension of time is believed to be necessary, however, in the event that any additional fees are required, please charge those fees and any other required fees to **IBM Corporation Deposit Account Number 50-0563.**

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew J. Dillon
Reg. No. 29,634
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116
(512) 343-6446 Facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS